



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 10/014,801 | 12/14/2001 | Wilhelmus G.M. Bruls | P 284153 9407US/CN1/1 | 1643 |
| 909 | 7590 | 11/13/2003 | | |
| PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP | | | | |
| P.O. BOX 10500 | | | | |
| MCLEAN, VA 22102 | | | | |
| | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | WOODWARD, ANA LUCRECIA | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1711 | |

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Advisory Action | Application No. 10/014,801 | Applicant(s) BRULS ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Ana L. Woodward | Art Unit 1711 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet


 Ana L. Woodward
 Examiner
 Art Unit: 1711

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of process claims 1-12, 22, 25 and 26 because Shih et al does not reasonably suggest the mixing of a solid masterbatch (of polymer and rubber) with a solid matrix polymer.

Continuation of 10. Other: Process claims 1-12, 22, 25 and 26 are allowable over the prior art of record. Applicants' arguments are not persuasive with respect to the rejections of the remaining claims. It is maintained that the examples 2-6 of the reference, containing nylon, functionalized rubber and non-functionalized rubber, read on the three component composition of claim 27 and render obvious the similar composition of claims 13 and 23 because polymers other than nylon can be employed by the reference. The process limitation governing the ethylene copolymer renders claim 15 a product-by-process claim. Applicants' have not established that the product of claim 14 is not the same as or obvious from that set forth by the reference examples. .